

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13-15, 20-21 and 24-29 were examined by the Office, and in the final Office Action of November 25, 2008 all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1, 4, 10, 13, 15, 20 and 27 are amended. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Support for the amendments can be found at least from page 7, lines 6-8 and page 11, lines 1-14. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

This response is submitted along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

Claim Rejections Under § 102

In section 9, on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13-15, 20-21 and 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by O'Neill (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2003/0176188). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by O'Neill, because O'Neill fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to recite that in response to the request for full authentication a reauthentication identity is transmitted, which is then used in the request for reauthentication. Applicant respectfully submits that O'Neill at least fails to disclose or suggest these limitations recited in claim 1.

In contrast to claim 1, O'Neill discloses that a remote access message (550) is transmitted towards an access node (128) to request access to a remote access service. The message (550) includes a network access identifier (NAI) having a user part and a realm part. The realm part identifies the home AAA server (114) of the mobile node (202). This allows the access node (128) to send an authentication and authorization request message towards a visited AAA server (135), which generates and sends a proxy AAR message towards the home AAA server (114). See O'Neill paragraph [0053]. However, O'Neill does not disclose or suggest transmitting to the terminal a reauthentication identity including a unique realm name uniquely identifying the authentication server in response to receiving a request for full authentication from the terminal. Instead, O'Neill does not disclose that the realm part of the NAI identifying the home AAA server (114) is transmitted to the MN (202), and is silent on how the MN (202) is provided this information. Furthermore, claim 1 distinguishes between a request for full authentication and a request for reauthentication. O'Neill is silent regarding full authentication and reauthentication,

and only states that the request is for access to a remote access service while in the visited domain. Therefore, since O'Neill fails to disclose or suggest reauthentication, O'Neill also necessarily fails to disclose or suggest receiving a request for reauthentication including the reauthentication identity, as recited in claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by O'Neill and applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1.

Independent claims 4, 10, 13, 15, 20 and 27 are amended to include limitation similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, these independent claims are not disclosed or suggested by O'Neill.

The claims rejected above and depending from the above mentioned independent claims, are not disclosed or suggested by O'Neill at least in view of their dependencies.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 18, on page 7 of the Office Action, claims 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over O'Neill in view of Barriga-Caceres et al. (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2003/0163733). Claims 14 and 21 ultimately depend from an independent claim, and Barriga-Caceres fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of O'Neill identified above. Therefore, claims 14 and 21 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 23-0442 any fee deficiency required to submit this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 23 February 2009

Keith R. Obert
Keith R. Obert
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
Customer No. 004955